

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
6

7 CHRISTOPHER OTEY

No. C 12-5524 CRB (MEJ)

8 Plaintiff,

**DISCOVERY ORDER**  
**RE: DKT. NO. 72**

9 v.

10 CROWDFLOWER, INC., et al.,

11 Defendants.  
12 \_\_\_\_\_/

13 The Court is in receipt of the parties' joint discovery dispute letter, filed March 14, 2013.  
14 Dkt. No. 72. The letter relates to 203 Requests for Admission and 139 Requests for Production that  
15 Plaintiff has served on Defendants. Defendants have responded to 86 of Plaintiff's RFAs and  
16 agreed to respond to 43 of Plaintiff's RFPs by April 8, 2013. However, as Defendants have filed a  
17 motion to bifurcate, which seeks to preliminarily focus discovery and motion practice in this action  
18 on the issue of whether Defendants were Plaintiff's "employer" for purposes of the FLSA and  
19 Oregon law, Defendants request entry of a protective order from responding to the remainder of  
20 Plaintiff's RFAs and RFPs until after Judge Breyer rules on the bifurcation/stay motion. In addition,  
21 Defendants argue that Plaintiff has already filed a motion for conditional collective-action  
22 certification and there is therefore no purpose, at this stage, in conducting class discovery. Upon  
23 review of the parties' letter, the Court agrees that it is prudent to limit discovery until such time as  
24 Judge Breyer has determined the bifurcation motion. Accordingly, Defendants' request for a  
protective order is GRANTED.

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED**

26  
27 Dated: March 15, 2013

28 \_\_\_\_\_  
Maria-Elena James  
United States Magistrate Judge